DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 962 JC 840 435

AUTHOR Van Enoo, Sharon
TITLE A Study of the Organization and Budgeting Process of the Connecticut and California Community Colleges: What Can Be Learned from the Contrast?
PUB DATE 30 Jun 84
NOTE 41p.; Graduate seminar paper, Pepperdine University.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Colleges; *Educational Finance; Educational History; *Financial Support; Government Role; Government School Relationship; *School District Autonomy; State Aid; *State Legislation; State Surveys; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California; *Connecticut

ABSTRACT

Drawing from an extensive literature review and interviews with state officials, this paper examines the different methods used in the funding processes of the community colleges in Conncecticut and California, traces the evolution of these funding systems, and offers recommendations on how the two states can learn from the recent changes each has encountered. Following introductory material on the present dissatisfaction with funding methods, the purpose of the study, and the significance of the problem, the paper looks at the basic organizational structures and the budget processes of the two state systems. Next, updates are provided on recent changes in the states, highlighting funding problems that in Connecticut resulted in the creation of the Governor's Commission on Higher Education and the Economy and an extensive review of the budgeting process; and that in California resulted in a philosophical battle with the governor, the imposition of a $50 per semester tuition charge, and the initiation of a differential funding study. Noting that as Connecticut moves toward less state control, California is moving toward more state control, the final section offers a series of recommendations for Connecticut decision makers to consider in continuing on a path of balanced state and local control and for California decision makers to consider in responding to the political, financial, and educational environment. A bibliography and financial data are appended. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED246962

A STUDY OF THE ORGANIZATION AND BUDGETING PROCESS OF THE CONNECTICUT AND CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES: WHAT CAN BE LEARNED FROM THE CONTRAST?

By

Sharon Van Enoo

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Van Enoo

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Pepperdine University
July 30, 1984

JC 840 435

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem

Purpose

Significance of the Problem

REPORT OF THE STUDY 3

The Organization and Budget Process of Connecticut Community Colleges

The Organization and Budget Process of California Community Colleges

Connecticut Update

California Update

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 16

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 17

Summary and Conclusion

Recommendations

Recommendations for Further Investigation

BIBLIOGRAPHY 22

APPENDICES 25

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

During the last 200 years Connecticut has been well known for its prestigious private colleges and universities and for the affluence of its population in general. On the other hand, California has built a reputation on diversity. California is a much larger state, with a socio-economically and ethnically diverse population. It has a strong reputation for local governance and local support of education through the fourteenth grade level. These factors as well as others have had a tremendous impact on the development and financing of Connecticut and California's public higher education, specifically on the funding of the community college system.

Recently the community colleges in both states have experienced several years of reduced funding. The reduction in funding was imposed because of reduced revenues into the State's General Fund. These reductions, primarily, were caused by tax limitation measures and/or the recession that occured with the onset of the Reagan Administration. Because of the critical consequences to the normal functioning of the community colleges in Connecticut and California, legislation was enacted for the purpose of reevaluating the present funding processes used for the apportionment of funds to the community colleges. The present dissatisfaction of the funding methods in place has critical consequences on the management and operation of the community colleges in each state.

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to examine and compare the financial processes used in the funding of community colleges in Connecticut

and California. More specifically, the objectives of this study are as follows:

1. Review the different methods used in the funding processes of the community colleges of Connecticut and California.
2. Identify the evolution of each funding system to the present day.
3. Make recommendations on how Connecticut and California can learn from the recent changes each state has encountered.

Significance of the Problem

Without extensive and significant review of the historical process already experienced in each state, a funding procedure could be legislated and established that would have serious and possibly adverse affects on the management and operation of the community colleges.

Specifically, California needs to evaluate the experiences of other states such as Connecticut which already have a history of state control and review their evolvement away from total state control.

REPORT OF THE STUDY

The Organization and Budget Process of Connecticut Community Colleges

Connecticut's historical background with private universities, such as Yale, and the relative prosperity of the population has had significant influence on governmental policy as it related to the development of a state public higher education system.

A. The Basic Organizational Structure:

The General Assembly of the State of Connecticut authorized the development of a Board of Higher Education which manages all public supported post-secondary education. Presently the system has one university, four state universities, three state technical colleges (2 year vocational) and twelve community colleges (2 year transfer and occupational).[1] The community colleges originally started as extensions of the State University system.[2]

Under the Board of Higher Education (BHE) is a Board of Trustees for each post-secondary system. The Community College Board of Trustees was incorporated in 1965. It has sixteen members with twelve positions being held by local regional representatives. The regional representative chairs the regional council that was established for each community college. Board of Trustee members are usually business and professional members of the community and are appointed by the Governor.

---

[1] Self-Accreditation Committee, "Mohegan Community College Self-Study Report for 1980-81," p. 22

[2] Carnegie Commission, "The Open-Door Colleges" A Digest of Reports of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984) p. 25.

The Executive Director works for the Board of Trustees and manages the Central office staff. The twelve community college Presidents make up the President's Council and report directly to the Executive Director. Under the President's Council are the Councils of Academic Deans, Deans of Administration, Deans of Student Affairs and Deans of Community Services. In addition, there are affiliate councils that report to the Councils of Deans. The Councils of Deans make recommendations to both the Council of Presidents and directly to the Executive Director.

Since this is a State system, each community college tends to have a similar basic organizational structure, a President and four Deans with a variety of directors, coordinators and other staff personnel reporting to them. In addition, the respective regional representative of the Borad of Trustees chairs their respective regional council. The Regional Councils were established as the local community advisory board for each college.[3]

B. The Budget Process:

Working two years in advance, the college President and Deans develop a proposed budget. Taking into consideration projected FTE (Full-Time Equivalency-for credit courses only), expected tuition (which goes into the State General Fund), auxillary fees (which go into a collective community college account), contract negotiations, and increases in utility costs they write a proposed budget for continuing present instructional programs, services, maintenance requirements, and staff needs. In addi-

---

[3] Myrna Miller, President of Mohegan Community College, interview held in Norwich, Connecticut, June 1984.

tion, they develop proposals for program reductions or growth, new programs, equipment needs, staff increases and reorganizational proposals. They must write an extensive justification for the continuing budget and for the proposed changes.[4]

When this process has been completed at the college level, the Presidents then go to the Executive Director to negotiate all of the above on a detailed (line item) basis. Programs and personnel must be justified and then budgets are reduced or increased accordingly. Once the Executive Director has gone through this process with each college President, she/he, determines the needs of the Central Staff Office, then a proposed budget for the whole system is presented to the Board of Trustees.

The Executive Director repeats the process by negotiating with the Board of Trustees on a line item basis for each college President's requests for program changes and staffing.

When the Board of Trustees decides on a system budget, it is presented to the State Board of Higher Education. The negotiating process is resumed for all segments of higher education by each respective Board of Trustees. Eventually, the Connecticut General Assembly and the Governor receive a budget request for all the State's public post-sencondary education institutions. They determine the appropriation for each of the higher education systems based on that request. Since Connecticut does not have a state income derived from property taxes as California does, funds used by the legislature for community college come, primarily, from

---

[4]William Kaszubski, Director of Fiscal Operations at Mohegan Community College, interview held in Norwich, Connecticut, June 1984.

sales tax (Connecticut has the second highest rate in the nation)[5] and tuition charges.

Traditionally, general appropriations have been awarded on an incremental basis, "What you received last year you may get again this year."[6] There is little incentive or encouragement to fund growth or innovative program changes.

The allocation of funds is not based on any standard formula and is apportioned to each institution by the Board of Trustees based on the Executive Director's recommendation. The rules governing the use of funds are quite rigid. Funds allocated for each of the four major categories; Personnel Services, Other Expenses, Equipment and Educational Equipment (Appendix I is an example of how the major categories are defined) may not be moved around at the local level. However, the local campus has some autonomy in moving funds acquired through fees charged to students for auxiliary services but the movement and the amount is relatively limited.[7]

The Organization and Budget Process Of The California Community Colleges

California started supporting public post-secondary education in the early 1900's through Teacher's Colleges (now known as the University of California system). However, junior colleges evolved as extensions of the local public high school system and were under the control of local Boards as well as the State Department of Education. For several decades after World War II they continued to be known as junior colleges with an emphasis on transfer education. During the 1960's they became community

---

[5]Carol Nielsen, Director of Student Development, interviewed at Mohegan Community College, Norwich, Connecticut, June 1984.

[6]Kaszubaski, June 1968

[7]Kaszubaski, June 1984

colleges and were largely supported and built with local funds. Often, they became both the cultural and education center of the community. Presently, there are 107 community colleges in California.

A. The Basic Organizational Structure:

The California State Legislature established three different systems of post-secondary education, both the University of California (UC) system under a Board of Regents and the California State University (CSU) system under a Board of Trustees, are state funded and state controlled.

In 1968 the California Legislature established the Board of Governors to be the chief policy making board for the community colleges. Members are appointed by the Governor. The Board of Governors recommends possible legislation to the legislature for community colleges, establishes minimum standards, and carries out necessary regulatory and compliance functions. The operational arm of the Board of Governors is the State Chancellor's Office. The Board selects the State Chancellor who supervises an extensive staff.[3]

Each of the seventy community college districts within the State system has a local Board of Trustees (primarily community elected private citizens) who determines local policy, hire the community college President and authorizes the expenditure of a local line item budget. Since the community colleges are local systems, each college district tends to have a different organizational structure. However, there does seem to be a general pattern of organization with a President and Vice Presidents/Deans as the primary administrative officers. All college programs, services and personnel fall under three general categories: Business, Instruction and Student Personnel.

---

[8]Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, State and Facts: The California Community College in 1982 (Sacramento, CA: ERIC Document ED 217 929) p.3

B. The Budget Process:

The budgeting process for California Community Colleges, as stated in an interview with Joseph Freitas, Administrative Officer for Fiscal Services in the Chancellor's Office, starts with the Chancellor's staff preparing a Yearly Budget Change Proposal which includes possible increases, COLAS, and growth funds for apportionments and funds for Special Services (EOPS and HSPS). Once the Board of Governors approves the proposal, it is sent to the Department of Finance which reviews and modifies it. The Department of Finance makes its recommendation to the Governor. Then the Governor's budget goes through a series of legislative reviews to approve or modify the proposed budget. The agreed upon budget as determined by the legislature is then sent to the Governor. The Governor has the final "blue pencil" so he either approves it as is or adjusts the proposed budget.[9]

Each college receives its apportionment based on a formula that is calculated on ADA (Average Daily Attendance). This formula is dependent on previous year's data, and is outlined in SB851.

Meanwhile, at the local college a budgeting process has already begun for the following year. Line item budgets are being developed based on expected apportionment, other revenues, inflation factors, union contracts, etc. It is developed on a departamental level. The President, with the assistance of his Vice Presidents, finalizes a proposed budget and presents it to the local Board of Trustees for final approval.[10]

Once the apportionment is made to the local college and supported by local ADA documentation, the Board of Trustees is free to make adjust-

---

[9]Joseph Freitas, Administrative Office for Fiscal Services, Chancellor's Office, telephone interview, July, 1984.

[10]Patricia Goodberry, Director of Fiscal Services, interview held at El Camino College in Torrance, California, July, 1984.

ments on how it is to be used, provided 50 percent of the budget is spent on instructors' salaries.

Connecticut Update

Connecticut and California Community Colleges, both, believe in a rather general philosophy: open access with educational opportunities in transfer programs, vocational/occupational training and community services or courses for life-long learning opportunities.

Beyond this general philosophical background these two systems differ greatly in the operational implementation of the philosophy. The Connecticut system, through its twelve community colleges serves a population of over 30,000 students. Two-thirds of the students are women.[11] Eighty-Five percent of the operational budget is state revenues and the other fifteen percent of the operational budget comes from tuition and fees. (See Appendix 2, Schedule of Tuition and Fees).

Over the last fifteen years, in Connecticut, various levels of government have been quite influential in the operational decision-making framework of the community colleges. To counter act this process, in 1980, the General Assembly enacted legislation guaranteeing state educational institutions sole jurisdiction over educational equipment expenditures and eliminating review and approval of such expenditures by any other state agency. In addition, adjustments could now be made among the four major categories periodically during the year. Further, it was legislated that student fees collected to support auxillary college services could be retained by each college and expended as the college determined.[12]

---

[11] Joseph Gervascio, "Board of Trustees Regional Community Colleges, State of Connecticut, Financial Report Ending June 30, 1982" p.5.

[12] Self-Accreditation Committee, p. 24.

Nineteen Eighty-One was a critical year for the Connecticut Community Colleges. By then they had lost one million dollars of a 33 million dollar budget. (See Appendix 3, Statement of Appropriations,...) Wattenbarger identified Connecticut Community Colleges as having "insufficient funding to maintain the open door."[13] He went on to say that the budget restrictions of the past few years had reduced program quality and had restricted effective decision-making.

In response to these problems, the Governor's Commission on Higher Education and the Economy was established. After an extensive review of the total higher education system the following actions were taken upon the Commission's recommendations:

1. The Board of Higher Education was changed to the Board of Governors of Higher Education (BGHE). Its eleven members are appointed by the Governor and the controlling legislative party leadership. The BGHE's primary responsibilities include policy-making authority, establishing criteria for closures and mergers of the public institutions, and setting minimum standards for licensure of both public and private institutions,as well as budget recommendations for all higher education.[14]
2. A joint committee of all the segments of higher education were requested to develop a formula or program based budgeting system that would meet the unique needs of the Connecticut public system, an approach that would provide adequate funds for each college and

---

[13]James Wattenbarger and Patick Bibby, Financing Community Colleges 1981, (Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida: ERIC Document, ED 207 631), p. 49.

[14]"Chairman of BOG Speaks Out on Education," The Joint Effort, Special Edition, Mohegan Community College (Connecticut), May 7, 1984, p.1

university and would equitably distribute state resources available to higher education.[15]

The recommendation to change the budgeting process was made on the Commission's finding that the present budgeting system was, "incompatible with effective decision making"[16] and showed no correlation between appropriation accounts (the four major categories) and institutional activities, program needs and institutional priorities. To cite just one example of the arbitary decision-making process in effect: the President of one of the community colleges requested an additional maintenance person to be paid from General funds. The Executive Director agreed to support this request when it was presented to the Board of Trustees. When the budget was returned to the campus, the Board of Trustees had decided to move an account clerk from the Auxiliary Fund to the General Fund then authorized a clerk in the Registar's office. Unfortunately, the campus did not have the physical space for a new clerk, it did not have the appropriate furniture or office equipment available, and it still had a serious personnel shortage in the Maintenance Department.

The Formula Development Advisory Committee has worked extensively for two years. By Fall of 1984 a formula process will be in place for Instruction, Library Services and Physical Plant Maintenance that is to be used by all segments of higher education and, hopefully, will move the budget decision-making to a more objective and relevant level. The new formula has

---

[15]Norma Foreman Glasgow, Commissioner, Memorandum on Formula Budget Guidelines for Instruction, Library Services and Physical Plan Maintenance, 31 May, 1984, State of Connecticut Dept. of Higher Education, Hartford, Conn.

[16]Board of Governors for Higher Education, "Formula Budget Guidelines for Instruction, Library Services, Physical Plant Maintenance," Hartford, Connecticut, April 1984, p.1.

"variable" and "fixed" factors for each type of post-secondary institution. It is believed that this formula approach which is, essentially zero-based will provide BGHE with better information about the use of base level resources, support justification of the higher education budget base, and allow for comparison between equitable or comparable programs.[17] The community colleges are relying on the new formulae to give them a fair share of the education dollar.

California Update

When implementing the basic philosophy of community college education, California operationalized the philosophy in terms of geographic availability, comprenhensiveness of the offered programs and services, equity of educational opportunity as a tuition free system, and strong local governance. The recommendations made by the Carnegie Commission in the 1970 article, "The Open Door Colleges"[18] seem to be patterned after the California Community Colleges model. By 1982 California, through 107 community colleges was serving in excess of 1,300,000 students. Fifty-two percent were women.[19] One-hundred percent of the operational budget comes from State and local revenues. Before 1978 (Proposition 13) California had a tax structure that allowed both State and local government to levy taxes. Sales and property taxes were, and still are, the most lucrative source of state revenue.

Over the last ten years as Connecticut's Community Colleges were attempting to move away from total state control, California's budgeting process has been a rather stormy move toward greater State control. Before 1973

---

[17] Ibid., p.7

[18] Carnegie Commission, p.23

[19] James Wattenbarger & James Heck, Financing Community Colleges, 1983 (Institute of Higher Educ., University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida: ERIC Document, ED 232 751). p.10

college district revenues were generated using the minimum foundation process. A flat rate per student was set by the State Legislature to fund a basic instructional program. If a district wished to offer more than a basic level of service, the local Board of Trustees could levy additional local taxes with approval of the local electorate. Each district made separate and distinct choices relating to add-on funds to the state minimum according to district wealth. Eventually each district had a different dollar amount assigned to a minimum basic unit of measure (ADA). This disparity in funding per district became the base figure that all future legislation has affected.[20]

After 1973 a variety of legislative bills were passed that were intended, first, to be an incentive for growth, then later, they were to place limits on growth of ADA in order to reduce State expenditures to community colleges. In 1978 the California electorate passed Proposition 13. Immediately, funding was changed to a block grant process (AB8) based on prior year revenues because now, all property taxes went into the general fund so the ability of local governments to levy taxes was sharply curtailed. Unfortunately this left a wide disparity among the districts of actual revenue generated by the previous ADA driven formula. The passage of Proposition 13 dramatically changed and centralized community college funding at the state level. The Block grant formula considers both state and local revenue as a package when determining the level of funding for community colleges. This legislation effectively constituted a major erosion of local Board control.[21]

Since 1979 legislation has passed that was primarily designed to equalize

---

[20]Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Finance of California Community Colleges, Workbook, (1982: ERIC Document ED 224 544), p.6.

[21]Ibid., p.7

funding rates per ADA among the districts and to further cap growth.[22]

By 1982 there were no more funds appropriated for inflation or growth, plus there was an additional loss of $30 million for recreational/avocational classes. Because of these major shifts in funding, compounded by the original disparity in ADA expenditures per district, some districts were moved to the edge of bankruptcy.[23]

The loss of funds of both California and Connecticut were primarily induced by the recent recession. However, as Connecticut began to build its system anew with the Governor's Commission making recommendations for a more equitable funding pattern among the higher education institutions, California became embroiled in a serious philosophical battle with Governor George Deukmejian over the issue of charging tuition at the community colleges. With the Governor's "blue penciling" of 96 million dollars and subsequent compromise legislation, SB 1XX, California lost its only avenue to a tuition free post-secondatry education. SB 1XX mandates a fifty dollar per semester tuition charge that will go into the State General Fund and become part of the revenues used in apportioning funds for the community colleges.

The 1983 California Community College Finance Law, SB 851, (Aug.1983) that preceded the subsequent compromise legislation of AB 1XX (June, 1984) reaffirmed the legislative position that apportioned State aid to community college districts should be determined from base revenues set by each district and then adjusted for changes in ADA, with growth limitations, inflation and equalization factors. Because there is still major discontent over

---

[22]Joseph Freitas, July 1984.

[23]Academic Senate, p.7

the revenue differences per ADA for each district, the legislature authorized $100,000 to fund a study of differential funding for the State's community colleges. (See Appendix 4, Senate Bill 851, page 22)

California legislators seem to be relying on the outcome of the differential funding study for implementing equity among districts and better accountability for the state dollar.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Despite the obvious differences in the origin of the Connecticut and California Community Colleges as well as the operational aspects of these two systems, combined with the polarity of governance, the extreme differences in size, and the types of programs and services offered, there are come significant similarities between these two systems. Both systems legislated a State governing board; Connecticut with its Community College Board of Trustees and California with its Board of Governors. Each State Board has its operational staff located in the State Capitol. The State office carries out the wishes of the Board as it affects the local colleges and acts as an advisor to its respective legislature. Both Boards have been in existance about fifteen years.

From the extensive legislation identified above, it appears that the Connecticut and California Community colleges have come under the direct scrutiny of their respective legislatures. The main issues of concern in both States seem to be, (1) funding inequities and (2) decision-making authority.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary and Conclusion

The problem, as stated earlier, is the present dissatisfaction and the critical consequences of the funding methods in place on the management and operation of the community colleges of Connecticut and California.

Through extensive personal interviews and research regarding the evolvement of the budget process in both Connecticut and California, it appears that Connecticut is moving toward less State control just at the time California is moving toward more. Connecticut started off with total State control; successive reductions in apportionment along with budget, curriculum and equipment decisions made by government agencies too far away from the actual college operation, has created a realization that the present State budgeting methods were incompatible with effective decision-making. The first steps toward reducing decision-making at the legislative level has been taken with the implementation of an objective formula and program based funding process. It is hoped that this will reduce the opportunity for members of the General Assembly to determine local curriculum, personnel and equipment needs based on political considerations rather than objective formula driven data.

California, on the other hand, has historically responded to the specific requests and needs of the local community and has limited the State's ability to affect instructional programs and operational expenses at the local level. Since the enactment of Proposition 13, the State legislature has taken a special interest in requiring data from the local level on instruction, services and all other operational costs in order to assess education expenses.

Ultimately they wish to show reasonable justification for "capping" the cost of community college education. For now, the State wants more accountability for its dollar, wants to establish well-defined spending limits, wants greater formula equity among districts and wants greater justification on how the State benefits from these expenditures.

Recommendations

In order for Connecticut to continue on a path of balanced State and local control, California's methods should be considered when examining the following issues:

1. There needs to be a more clearly defined statement of the decision-making responsibility at all agency levels with particular attention given to allowing more budget flexibility and decision-making at the local campus. Authority needs to be better aligned with responsibility.
2. The number of students that form the base of the education formula is seriously affected by the continued loss of the student pool through the out-migration of college bound students [24] and by the continuing drop in the birthrate.[25] Less obvious, but just as serious, is the need to redefine the potential community college population with respect to rising tuition and fee costs and a growing reluctance of people to be pacified with availability of additional financial

---

[24]Connecticut has the fourth largest out-migration of college bound students in the nation as shown in Robert Zemsky and Penney Oedel The Structure of College Choice quoted by Jennifer Presley in "College Choice in New England," F.Y.I. Newsletter (Hartford, Connecticut, April, 1984)

[25]Jennifer Presley, "High School Graduates of Conn.: Projections to 2001," F.Y.I. Newsletter (Board of Governors for Higher Education, Hartford, Connecticut: June, 1984).

aid.[26]

3. Greater efficiency of educational resources and opportunities would occur with the expansion and combining of the two-year technical and community colleges. It appears that there is limited opportunity for men and women to make appropriate vocational/occupational changes without being faced with a change in college too. The fact that there is a serious imbalance of the sexes at these institutions may also be affecting students choice of program on a hidden criteria that is different from the one society generally approves of, interest and skills. In 1983, Wattenbarger identified inconsistant policies between these two types of colleges as a problem that has its affect on community college funding.[27]
4. There should be a reassessment of the future State and local manpower needs with an emphasis on out-reach and recruitment of the population most likely to fill it. According to Harbison and Myers, "The goals of modern societies are political, cultural and social as well as economic. Human resource development is a necessary condition for achieving all of them."[28]

Based on the information in this paper, and with consideration to the present political, financial and educational environment, California could learn from Connecticut's reason for moving away from State control as the following issues are addressed:

---

[26]Elaine El-khawas, "Family Income in the U.S.," Educational Record, Vol 65, No.1 (Winter, 1984) p.60.

[27]Wattenbarger and Heck, p.51.

[28]Frederick Harbison and Charles Myers, Education, Manpower, and Economic Growth (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964) p.13.

1. Keeping in mind the historical background of California and its commurity colleges this State needs to review what its own community colleges have done successfully before making any costly or major changes in developing new budget criteria. For example: a) local manpower needs are more easily identified and responded to at the local level, b) a funding formula of weekly contact hours is more accurate in figuring instructional costs than credits, c) when reduced funding occurs, the local college is in a better position to determine appropriate program cuts and d) the unmeasured political influence the community college has on the local community because of its role as the prime center for cultural and educational experiences, especially in the rural areas of the State, has not been addressed.
2. There needs to be clarification of specific decision-making responsibilities for all levels of government affecting community college education with a conscience effort to leave the most at the local level.
3. Reassessment of the manpower needs of California as a State and as local regions in an era of reduced funds to the major provider of higher education, Community Colleges. A look at the migration of industry out of California (such as Hughes Helicopter, Los Angeles Times, July 28, 1984, Part I, page 1) and the reasons behind their decisions to leave. Harbison and Myers states, "that human resource development may be a more realistic and reliable indicator of modernization or development than any other single measure."[29]

---

[29]Ibid., p. 14

4. Before differential funding becomes a reality, greater research needs to be gathered from other states who have it (i.e. Illinois) and the states who have recently disgarded it (i.e. Florida). The most serious problems with differential funding seem to be, a) determination of the fiscal value of curriculum areas and their vulnerability to the political process (the final decision may not be reflective of the actual educational needs of the community college population or the manpower needs of the local community), b) standardization under funds some schools and over funds others, c) it reduces opportunities for innovation and creativity by giving the decision-making power for funding to the group furthest from the consequences of the decision - namely the legislature, and 4) becomes vulnerable to zero-based budgeting practices: not giving appropriate lead time to increase, cut back, or terminate programs and personnel efficiently and humanely.

Recommendation for further investigation

The most important recommendation that can be made for both California and Connecticut is to take heed of Breneman's statement:

> "...disputes over financing policies and procedures often disguise fundamental disagreement over the purpose, mission and priorities of community colleges - the problems are not technical but substantive."[30]

---

[30]David Breneman and Susan Nelson, Financing Community Colleges, An Economic Perspective (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1981), p. 161.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Breneman, David and Nelson, Susan. Financing Community Colleges: An Economic Perspective. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1981.

Carnegie Commission. "The Open Door Colleges" in A Digest of Reports of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974. pp. 223-30.

Carnegie Commission. "Higher Education: Who Pays? Who Benefits? Who Should Pay?", in A Digest of Reports of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974. pp. 191-206

Harbison, Frederick and Myers, Charles. Education, Manpower, and Economic Growth. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Zemsky, Robert and Oedel, Penney. The Structure of College Choice. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1983. Reprinted by Jennifer Presley in "College Choice in New England", F.Y.I. Hartford, Ct.: April 1984.

Journal

El-Khawas, Elaine. "Family Income in the United States", Educational Record, vol. 65. no. 1 (Winter 1984). pp. 60-61.

Newspapers

Dame, Kathy. "Chairman of BOG Speaks Out on Education", The Joint Effort, Special Edition. Mohegan Community College, 7 May 1984.

Vartabedian, Ralph. "Hughes Will Shift Most of its Copter Jobs to Arizona", Los Angeles Times, 28 July 1984, Past I, p. 1.

Watkins, Beverly. "2-Year Colleges Told They're Becoming Institutions for Middle-Class Students", Chronicle of Higher Education, 11 April 1984. vol. XXVIII, no. 7, p. 1.

Microfilm Reproductions

Academic Senate for Community Colleges. Finance of California Community Colleges. Sacramento: Ca. ERIC ED 224 544.

Arney, Lawrence. State Patterns of Financial Support for Community Colleges. Gainerville: Fla. Institute of Higher Education. ERIC Document ED 038 129.

California Community Colleges Office of the Chancellor. Stats and Facts: The California Community Colleges in 1982. Sacramento: Ca. ERIC Document ED 217 929.

California State Post-Secondary Education Commission. Principles for Community College Finance, Commission Report 83-14. Sacramento; Ca. ERIC ED Document ED 232 714.

Kintzer, Frederick. Proposition 13: Implications for Community Colleges, Topical Paper No. 72. Washington D. C : National Institute of Education. ERIC Document ED 188 711.

Loftus, Virginia. The Funding Plan for the Illinios Public Community College System. New Orleans: La. ERIC Document ED 213 451.

Wattenbarger, James and Bibby, Patrick. Financing Community Colleges, 1981. Gainesville: Fla. Institution of Higher Educationk ERIC Document ED 207 631.

Wattenbarger, James and Heck, James. Financing Community Colleges, 1983. Gainesville: Fla. Institute of Higher Education. ERIC Document ED 232 751.

Wattenbarger, James and Starnes, Paul. Financial Support Patterns for Community Colleges, 1976. Gainesville: Fla. Institute of Higher Education, ERIC Document ED 132 994.

Reports

Board of Governors for Higher Education. "Formula Budget Guidelines for Instruction, Library Services and Physical Plant Maintenance". Hartford: Ct.. April 1984.

Gervascio, Joseph. "Financial Report, Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1982, Board of Trustees. Regional Community Colleges", Hartford; Ct. 1982.

Gooder, Glenn. "California Community Colleges, Differential Funding Study - Field Report #1". Sacramento: Ca. June 1984.

Presley, Jennifer. "High School Graduates in Connecticut: Projections to 2001", F.Y.I., Board of Governors for Higher Education, Hartford: Ct. June 1984.

* Self-Accreditation Committee. "Mohegan Community College, Self-Study Report for 1980-81." Norwich, Connecticut.

*

Memorandum

Foreman, Norma. Memorandum: "Formula Budget Guidelines for Instruction, Library Services and Physical Plant Maintenance". Hartford: Ct. Department of Higher Education, 31 May 1984. From the files of Myrna Miller.

McIntyre, Chuck. Memorandum: "SB 851 Cost Study: Practices in Other States", Sacramento; Ca. Analytical Studies Unit State Chancellor's Office, ASU Memo No. 47, 27 December 1983. From the files of Dr. Glenn Gooder.

Interviews

Eberly, Jack, Administrator for Fiscal Planning and Analysis, Division of Community Colleges, Florida Dept. of Education, Tallahassee: Fla. Telephone interview 3 July 1984.

Freitas, Joseph, Administrator of Fiscal Services, California Community College Chancellor's Office. Telephone interview 28 June 1984.

Gervascio, Joseph, Director of Finance, Central Office Board of Trustees for Connecticut Community Colleges. Telephone interview 3 July 1984.

Gooder, Glenn, Consultant, Chancellor's Office. Sacramento; Ca. Telephone interview 11 July 1984.

Goodberry, Patricia, Assistant to the Vice President of Fiscal Affairs, El Camino College, Torrance; Ca. Interview on 12 July 1984.

Kazubaski, William, Director of Fiscal Affairs, Mohegan Community College, Norwich; Ct. Interview 14 June 1984.

Lingenfelter, Paul, Deputy Director of Fiscal Affairs, Illinois Board of Higher Education, Springfield; Ill. Telephone interview 3 July 1984.

Miller, Myrna, President of Mohegan Community College, Norwich; Ct. Interview on 15 June 1984.

Nielsen, Carol, Director of Student Development, Mohegan Community College, Norwich; Ct. Interview 13 June 1984.

Legal Citation

California Community College Finance Law. Senate Bill 851, Chapter 565, Statutes of 1983 (1 August 1983).

California Community College Finance Law. Assembly Bill No. 1 (Sacramento; Ca. 26 January 1984).

Appendix 1

MONTHLY ANALYSIS OF APPROPRIATIONS REQUIREMENT
REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Year _____ _____ Community College App. #_____

Month _____ Payrolls to date _____ Remaining to EOQ_____ Remaining to EOY _____

	Expended to Date	To End of Quarter	Total Est. Expenditures End of Qtr.	To End of Year	Total Est. Expenditures to End of Yr.
001 PERSONAL SERVICES					
Biweekly Payrolls - Filled only (1-1)					
- Temporary (1-2)					
Part-time Lecturers (1-3)					
Student Labor (1-4)					
Longevity (1-6)					
Overtime Shift Diff. (1-7 & 1-8)					
Non-Quota Payrolls (1-11 & 1-1)					
Vacancies - To be filled					
Anticipated Turnover (Postions currently filled)					
Other Costs					
Estimated Expenditures					
Allotments to Date					
Adjusted Appropriation					
Balance to end of Qtr.					
Balance to end of year					
002 OTHER EXPENSE					
Estimated Expenditures					
Allotments to Date					
Adjusted Appropriation					
Balance to end of Qtr.					
Balance to end of year					
005 EQUIPMENT					
Estimated Expenditures					
Allotments to Date					
Adjusted Appropriation					
Balance to end of Qtr.					
Balance to end of year					
010 EDUCATIONAL EQUIPMENT					
Estimated Expenditures					
Allotments to Date					
Adjusted Appropriation					
Balance to end of Qtr.					
Balance to end of year					
SUMMARY					
Estimated Expenditures					
Allotments to Date					
Adjusted Appropriation					
Balance to end of Qtr.					
Balance to end of year					

FIXED CHARGES	Expend. to Date	To End of Quarter	Total Estim'td. Expend. End of Quarter	Allotmaut to Date	Balance To End of Quarter	To End of Year	Total Estim'td. Expend. to End of Yr.	Adjusted Appropriat'n	Bal. To End of Yr.
601 Refunds of Tuition									
602 Loans to College Students									
603 Work Study Program									
607 Scholarship Aid-Tuition Refunds									
TOTAL FIXED CHARGES									

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix 2

REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES
SCHEDULE OF TUITION AND FEES
FISCAL YEAR 1981-82

		AMOUNT
GENERAL FUND TUITION		
1. Full-time Student		
a) Connecticut resident		$150.00
b) Out-of-State resident		570.00
2. Part-time Student - per semester hour		
a) Connecticut resident		10.25
b) Out-of-State resident		38.00
3. TV Course Student - per course (3 credit hours)		30.75
AUXILIARY SERVICE FUND FEES		
1. Full-time Student - per semester		
a) College Service Fee		42.00
2. Part-time Student - per semester		
a) College Services Fee (½ credit)		7.50
b) " " " (1 to 4 credits)		15.00
c) " " " (5 or more credits)		3.50 credit
STUDENT ACTIVITY FUND FEES		
1. Full-time Student - per semester		10.00
2. Part-time Student - per semester		5.00
SPECIAL FEES	**FUND**	
1. Application Fee		
Full-time student	GF	10.00
Part-time Student	GF	10.00
2. Academic Support Fee (Deaf Student Program - Out of State students only)		1,000.00
3. Matriculation Fee	GF	10.00
4. Late Registration Fee	GF	5.00
5. Make-up Examination Fee (Final Exam)	GF	5.00
6. Graduation Fee - Not to exceed (Local Option)	SAF/IWF	20.00
7. Replacement of lost ID Card	SAF	1.00
8. CLEP Examination Fee		
For General or Subject Exams		
One Exam		22.00
Each additional exam same month		18.00
9. Academic Evaluation Fee	EEF	15.00
EXTENSION FUND FEES		
1. Summer Session Student - per semester hour		25.00
2. Extension Fund Student - per semester hour		27.00
3. Extension Fund Student - non-credit		*
*Rate set on a per course basis dependent upon course offered.		
4. TV Course Student - per course (3 credit hours)		7.25
5. Courses by Newspaper - per course (3 credit hours)		40.00
6. Subsidized Credit Courses - per credit hour		10.25

IDENTIFICATION OF FUND

GF - General Fund
ASF - Auxiliary Services Fun
SAF - Student Activity Fund
IWF - Institutional Welfare Fund
EEF - Educational Extension Fund

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Requirement for maintenance of effort requirement for services for the substantially handicapped persons in adult or summer session non-credit programs. Shall not be reduced unless waived for certain reasons.

(b) The chancellor shall conduct a differential funding study in consultation with an advisory committee composed of representatives from community college districts, the Department of Finance, the Office of the Legislative Analyst, and the California Postsecondary Education Commission. District representation on the advisory committee may include representatives of the students, faculty, administration, and governing board members.

(c) The study shall consider and make recommendations in at least the following areas:

(1) The appropriate number and character of support categories for the community colleges.

(2) An assessment of appropriate workload measures for each cost category based on each measure's relation to (A) costs of delivering the service, (B) fiscal incentives, and (C) the cost of collection and verification.

(3) The development of a procedure to establish appropriate support levels for each category based on an analysis of fixed and variable costs, the impact of inflation, and other factors that influence the adequacy of these support levels.

(4) The integration of student services as a component of district workload standards.

(5) Estimates of the impact of the recommended changes on individual district's budgets.

(6) Estimates of the costs associated with the implementation and operation of a differential funding system.

(d) The chancellor shall make a progress report to the Legislature on the study by March 15, 1984, and shall submit the final report by December 1, 1984.

(e) Until such time as the differential funding study is completed and the method of allocating state funds to community college districts is adjusted based on the differential funding study, no community college district providing services for substantially handicapped persons in adult or summer session noncredit programs shall reduce the level of those services below the level provided in the 1982–83 fiscal year, unless this requirement is waived by the Chancellor of the

STATEMENT OF
APPROPRIATIONS, ALLOCATIONS, EXPENDITURES AND LAPSE BALANCES
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1982
GENERAL FUND

	Original Legislative Appropriation For the Year	Appropriation Adjustments(1)	Revised Appropriation For the Year	Reduced Allocations	Imposed Reduction Lapses(2)	Actual Expenditures For the Year	College & Central Office Lapse. Balances	Total Reduction & Lapse Balances
PARENT ACCOUNTS FOR DISTRIBUTION BY THE BOARD								
Personal Services	$25,921,735	$	$25,921,735	[$25,239,118]	$682,617	$	$	$682,617
Other Expense	6,454,752	218,000	6,672,752	[6,537,015]	135,737			135,737
General Equipment	81,845		81,845	[77,753]	4,092			4,092
Educational Equipment	316,400		316,400	[300,580]	15,820			15,820
Loans to College Students	32,000		32,000	[32,000]				
Work Study Program	182,400		182,400	[182,400]				
Nursing Student Loans	3,900		3,900	[3,900]				
Refunds of Tuition	175,000		175,000	[175,000]				
Scholarship Aid Tuition Refunds	250,000		250,000	[250,000]				
Deaf Program	141,500		141,500	[134,425]	7,075			7,075
Total Parent Account	$37,559,532	$218,000	$33,777,532	[$32,932,191]	$845,341			$845,341
COLLEGES								
MANCHESTER								
Personal Services				$3,844,405		$3,844,336	$ 69	$ 69
Other Expense				852,237		852,068	169	169
General Equipment				8,080		8,080		
Educational Equipment				24,026		24,026		
Loans to College Students				2,385		1,151	1,234	1,234
Work Study Program				13,100		12,514	586	586
Total Manchester				$4,744,233		$4,742,175	$2,058	$2,058
NORTHWESTERN								
Personal Services				$1,614,505		$1,613,567	$ 938	$ 938
Other Expense				341,633		340,965	668	668
General Equipment				1,643		1,628	15	15
Educational Equipment				22,147		22,083	64	64
Work Study Program				5,065		5,065		
Total Northwestern				$1,984,993		$1,983,308	$1,685	$1,685

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPROPRIATIONS, ALLOCATIONS, EXPENDITURES, AND LAPSE BALANCES - continued

COLLEGES	Original Legislative Appropriation for the Year	Appropriation Adjustments (1)	Revised Appropriation For the Year	Reduced Allocations	Imposed Reduction Lapses (2)	Actual Expenditures For the Year	College & Central Office Lapse Balances	Total Reduction & Lapse Balances
NORWALK								
Personal Services				$2,557,970		$2,557,955	$ 15	$ 15
Other Expense				1,176,399		1,176,347	52	52
General Equipment				1,596		1,596		
Educational Equipment				17,877		17,875	2	2
Loans to College Students				1,195		1,195		
Work Study Program				18,318		18,318		
Total Norwalk				$3,773,355		$3,773,286	$ 69	$ 69
HOUSATONIC								
Personal Services				$2,480,876		$2,479,387	$1,489	$1,489
Other Expense				815,654		815,391	263	263
General Equipment				7,286		7,244	42	42
Educational Equipment				19,299		19,293	6	6
Loans to College Students				900		--	900	900
Work Study Program				3,900		2,435	1,465	1,465
Total Housatonic				$3,327,915		$3,323,750	$4,165	$4,165
MIDDLESEX								
Personal Services				$1,959,679		$1,958,603	$1,076	$1,076
Other Expense				324,640		324,581	59	59
General Equipment				6,261		6,260	1	1
Educational Equipment				20,640		20,640		
Work Study Program				26,811		23,905	2,906	2,906
Loans to College Students				574		574		
Total Middlesex				$2,338,605		$2,334,563	$4,042	$4,042
GREATER HARTFORD								
Personal Services				$2,283,709		$2,283,353	$ 356	$ 356
Other Expense				737,122		736,222	900	900
General Equipment				1,373		1,363	10	10
Educational Equipment				28,648		28,645	3	3
Loans to College Students				1,588		--	1,588	1,588
Work Study Program				17,943		17,943		
Nursing Student Loans				420		--	420	420
Total Greater Hartford				$3,070,803		$3,067,526	$3,277	$3,277

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPROPRIATIONS, ALLOCATIONS, EXPENDITURES, AND LAPSE BALANCES - continued

COLLEGES	Original Legislative Appropriation for the Year	Appropriation Adjustments[1]	Revised Appropriation for the Year	Reduced Allocations	Imposed Reduction Lapses[2]	Actual Expenditures for the Year	College & Central Office Lapse Balances	Total Reduction & Lapse Balances
MATTATUCK (3)								
Personal Services				$2,835,156		$2,828,356	$ 6,800	$ 6,800
Other Expense				286,862		285,574	1,288	1,288
General Equipment				1,862		1,862		
Educational Equipment				21,913		21,676	237	237
Loans to College Students				19,087		2,009	17,078	17,078
Work Study Program				33,076		27,181	5,895	5,895
Nursing Student Loans				2,665			2,665	2,665
Total Mattatuck				$3,200,621		$3,166,658	$33,963	$33,963
SOUTH CENTRAL								
Personal Services				$1,726,931		$1,726,851	$ 80	$ 80
Other Expense				498,780		498,772	8	8
General Equipment				1,330		1,330		
Educational Equipment				18,572		18,489	83	83
Loans to College Students				4,821			4,821	4,821
Work Study Program				22,747		15,973	6,774	6,774
Total South Central				$2,273,181		$2,261,415	$11,766	$11,766
TUNXIS								
Personal Services				$1,716,355		$1,716,355		
Other Expense				397,174		397,174		
General Equipment				3,382		3,382		
Educational Equipment				19,390		19,390		
Work Study Program				14,140		14,140		
Total Tunxis				$2,150,441		$2,150,441	-0-	-0-
MOHEGAN								
Personal Services				$1,478,859		$1,478,855	$ 4	$ 4
Other Expense				248,168		247,969	199	199
General Equipment				1,235		1,232	3	3
Educational Equipment				17,803		14,134	3,669	3,669
Loans to College Students				1,450		(15)	1,465	1,465
Work Study Program				9,675		4,593	5,082	5,082
Nursing Student Loans				815		--	815	815
Total Mohegan				$1,758,005		$1,746,768	$11,237	$11,237

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPROPRIATIONS, ALLOCATIONS, EXPENDITURES, AND LAPSE BALANCES - continued

COLLEGES	Original Legislative Appropriation for the Year	Appropriation Adjustments (1)	Revised Appropriation for the Year	Reduced Allocations	Imposed Reduction Lapses (2)	Actual Expenditures for the Year	College & Central Office Lapse Balances	Total Reduction & Lapse Balances
QUINEBAUG VALLEY								
Personal Services				$681,784		$681,784	$	$
Other Expense				120,289		116,388	3,901	3,901
General Equipment				879		802	77	77
Educational Equipment				2,542		2,542		
Work Study Program				4,030		2,602	1,428	1,428
Total Quinebaug Valley				$809,524		$804,118	$ 5,406	$ 5,406
ASNUNTUCK								
Personal Services				$1,016,333		$1,016,333		
Other Expense				448,269		448,269		
General Equipment				1,026		1,026		
Educational Equipment				16,473		16,473		
Work Study Program				13,595		13,595		
Total Asnuntuck				$1,495,696		$1,495,696	-0-	-0-
OFFICE OF THE BOARD								
Personal Services (4)				$1,042,556		$ 855,570	$186,986	$186,986
Other Expense				289,788		279,776	10,012	10,012
General Equipment				41,800		41,631	169	169
Educational Equipment				71,250		71,250		
Total Office of the Board				$1,445,394		$1,248,227	$197,167	$197,167
DEAF PROGRAM - NORTHWESTERN C. C.				$134,425		$119,752	$14,673	$14,673
REFUNDS OF TUITION				$175,000		$169,533	$5,467	$5,467
SCHOLARSHIP AID TUITION REFUNDS				$250,000		$247,961	$2,039	$2,039
SUMMARY BY APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT								
Personal Services	$25,921,735	$	$25,921,735	$25,239,118	$682,617	$25,041,305	$197,813	$880,430
Other Expense	6,454,752	218,000	6,672,752	6,537,015	135,737	6,519,496	17,519	153,256
General Equipment	81,845		81,845	77,753	4,092	77,436	317	4,409
Educational Equipment	316,400		316,400	300,580	15,820	296,516	4,064	19,884
Loans to College Students	32,000		32,000	32,000		4,914	27,086	27,086
Refunds of Tuition	175,000		175,000	175,000		169,533	5,467	5,467
Work Study Program	182,400		182,400	182,400		158,264	24,136	24,136
Nursing Student Loans	3,900		3,900	3,900		-0-	3,900	3,900
Scholarship Aid Tuition Refunds	250,000		250,000	250,000		247,961	2,039	2,039
Deaf Program	141,500		141,500	134,425	7,075	119,752	14,673	21,748
SYSTEM GENERAL FUND GRAND TOTALS	$33,559,532	$218,000	$33,777,532	$32,932,191	$845,341	$32,635,177	$297,014	$1,142,355 (5)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOOTNOTES:

(1) Appropriation Adjustments:
Other Expense - Additional allotment to meet fuel and utility requirements from the State Energy Contingency Account - $218,000.

(2) Imposed Reduction Lapses - Imposed Reduction Lapses are funds the Regional Community College System was forced to lapse due to imposed budget reductions and recisions by the Office of Policy and Management.

(3) Mattatuck Community College is part of the Central Naugatuck Valley Higher Education Center and, therefore, many costs associated with the operation of the physical plants of Mattatuck are absorbed by the Higher Education Center.

(4) The Central Office of the Regional Community Colleges was required to lapse $101,000 in Personal Services by the Office of Policy and Management while provisions of the new contract necessitated Personal Service collective bargaining funds of $85,890 to be carried forward to 1982-83.

(5) Total Lapsed Balances: $1,142,355

Imposed Reduction Lapses	-	$ 845,341
College and Central Office Lapse Balances	-	297,014
Total Lapse Balance	-	$1,142,355

ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
AUG 31 1984
8118 Math-Sciences Building
Los Angeles, California 90024